DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 614 SO 023 694

AUTHOR Moody, Larrie J.
TITLE Growth, Meaning, and Drawing: Curriculum Construction for the Early Adolescent.
PUB DATE Apr 93
NOTE 30p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993).
AVAILABLE FROM Larrie J. Moody, Department of Art, Pittsburg State University, 1701 South Broadway, Pittsburgh, KS 66762.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Adolescents; *Aesthetic Education; *Art Education; *Curriculum Development; Curriculum Research; Freehand Drawing; Individual Development; Secondary Education; Secondary School Curriculum; *Secondary School Students; Teacher Student Relationship

ABSTRACT

Meaningful drawing curriculum construction is an especially difficult challenge for art teachers of early adolescent students, given such students' "crisis of confidence" with art skills and the cultural diversity of present day classrooms. This document describes an analysis of six published drawing instruction programs employing three approaches to teaching drawing that parallel three major developmental dimensions. The paper questions the notion of a generic curriculum, arguing that the best drawing programs take an eclectic approach. Guidelines for balanced and culturally relevant drawing programs that the study produced help explain how drawing content inappropriate for the sociocultural context can diminish learning. The document contains 24 references and six tables. (Author/SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN OTHER THAN PAPER COPY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

LARRIE J. MOODY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

ED 368 614

GROWTH, MEANING, AND DRAWING: CURRICULUM CONSTRUCTION FOR THE EARLY ADOLESCENT

Larrie J. Moody

Art Department
Pittsburg State University
Pittsburg, Kansas 66762

Running Head: DRAWING CURRICULUM CONSTRUCTION

(Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association Annual Meeting. Atlanta, GA, April 12-16, 1993.)

SO 023 694

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Meaningful drawing curriculum construction is an especially difficult challenge for art teachers of early adolescent students given their "crisis of confidence" with art skills and the cultural diversity of American classrooms. In this paper the author describes her analysis of six published drawing instruction programs in which she found three approaches to teaching drawing that parallel three major developmental dimensions. She questions the notion of a generic curriculum, arguing that drawing programs can best be constructed by taking an eclectic approach. Guidelines for balanced and culturally relevant drawing programs that resulted from the study are presented and used to explain how drawing content inappropriate for the sociocultural context can diminish learning.

Art teachers often use published curricula to develop drawing programs for their classes. Because culture as well as perceptual, cognitive, and psycho social growth impact the learning process, it is important for teachers to take them into account when selecting curricular resources and constructing drawing curricula. In this paper I will summarize a critical examination of six drawing programs suitable for early adolescent students (Moody, 1992), question the notion of a generic drawing program, and present guidelines for constructing balanced and culturally relevant drawing curricula.

Critical Examination of Six Drawing Programs

Using the Glaser & Strauss (1967) constant comparative method, I analyzed several contemporary drawing programs. The examined programs were: (a) Brookes, M. (1986). Drawing With Children; (b) Edwards, B. (1979). Drawing on the Right Side of the Brain; (c) Lowenfeld, V. & Brittain, W. L. (1982). Creative and Mental Growth; (d) McFee, J. K. & Degge, R. (1977). Art, Culture and Environment; (e) Wilson, B., Hurwitz, A., & Wilson, M. (1987). Teaching Drawing from Art; and (f) Wilson, M., & Wilson, B. (1982). Teaching Children to Draw.

Results indicated that each program exhibited a primary focus on one of three different dimensions of human development. Brookes, Edwards, and McFee and Degge were mainly focussed upon perception, the ability to identify, differentiate, and discriminate visual phenomena. Lowenfeld and Brittain were interested in psycho social development, feelings about personal and group experiences, self-esteem, and parental and peer

relationships. Cognition, the mental ability to code information symbolically, form and remember concepts and constructs, and reason, seemed to be the primary concern of Wilson, Hurwitz and Wilson as well as Wilson and Wilson.

Even though awareness of the developmental focus of a drawing program can be useful for teachers, it is necessary to keep in mind that these foci are matters of degree. Further, due to the interactive nature of the dimensions (Caine & Caine, 1991; Sternberg & Salter, 1982) the foci do not suggest a pedagogical hierarchy. In other words, the drawing programs emphasizing cognition are not necessarily higher level drawing programs than those emphasizing perceptual or psycho social development .

Perceptual Drawing Programs

Brookes, Edwards, as well as McFee and Degge propose programs that emphasized perceptual development. While both Brookes' and Edwards' main interest is in guiding perceptions toward naturalistic representation of observed phenomena, they differ in approaches to perceiving (See Tables 1 and 2). Brookes teaches categorization of perceived line, shape, and value into one of five elements of shape. Edwards teaches relational perception of line, shape, and value for size, direction, and degree. Expressive perceptual qualities with Brookes' method would most likely result through variations in classification of perceptions. Expressive perceptual qualities with Edwards' method would result from idiosyncratic relationships of perceived particularities of observed models. I believe both Brookes and Edwards take a "skills" approach to instruction toward a mimetic endpoint that tends to diminish artistic knowledge and personal growth, overlooking critical aspects

of the experiences of young people, because neither consider the meaningfulness of the image in any substantial way.

****

Insert Tables 1 and 2

****

McFee and Degge (See Table 3) also emphasize perception as a way of teaching drawing. They describe learning to look in order to see and draw more creatively and expressively, implying a concern with promoting not only an awareness of the complexity of visual phenomena but also its potential for affective response. Because they consider the symbolic and emotional possibilities of drawing, theirs is a more well-rounded drawing program. They point out relationships between perceptions and abstract concepts, noting that richer perceptions provide foundations for richer verbal descriptions and mental images.

****

Insert Table 3

****

Psycho social Drawing Program

Lowenfeld and Brittain concentrate on self-esteem and creative thinking (See Table 4), yet they offer no concrete guidance in sensitivity to and discrimination of visual qualities or the relationship of those qualities to the meaning of the work. Taking a discovery approach, they opt instead for motivations to help students reflect upon their own experiences as well as media exploration to express them. Despite studies showing that creative thinking can be enhanced through a variety of methods (Snow & Yalow,

1982), creativity is not directly taught through this program. Nonetheless, the degree of creativity displayed in student drawings determines the level of quality. Further, naturalism is the endpoint for drawing development in this program, although there are no perceptual activities or drawing techniques for achieving naturalism included. I find these double-binds contradictory teaching strategies.

****

Insert Table 4

****

Cognitive Drawing Programs

Wilson, Hurwitz, and Wilson emphasize the cognitive nature of drawing, believing it to be a unique symbol system, informed by both perception and cultural canons (See Table 5). Because of the acknowledgment of a cultural component in drawing, they consider endpoints for drawing achievement other than naturalism, thereby opening the door for cultural pluralism. Unfortunately, I find their insistence upon fine art as the pinnacle of artistic achievement problematic due to the Eurocentric, male dominated valuing system that has historically determined "fine" from other forms of artistic expression (Parker & Pollock, 1981). Although they advocate geographical, racial, and ethnic cross-cultural awareness, their program does not clarify how these awarenesses might fit into the fine art hierarchy.

****

Insert Table 5

****

Wilson and Wilson believe drawing is a way of expressing symbolic realities (See Table 6). Awareness and analysis of everyday perceptions, and experiences, examination of moral attitudes, and determination of ideals are vehicles of symbolic reality exploration. They note parallel qualities between language and drawing, urging art educators to make use of interactive language teaching methods as models for teaching drawing. They suggest master drawings, popular graphics, and observations of nature as visual models for student drawings.

****

Insert Table 6

****

The Generic Drawing Curriculum

The authors of these six drawing programs offer them as models for drawing curriculum construction by classroom teachers. They present them as generic, requiring only minor adjustments, such as subject matter or exemplar selection, to make them appropriate and meaningful for students. I believe, however, that due to the wide diversity of student characteristics, cultures, subcultures, values, and regions in our country, such universal drawing programs are not feasible.

These programs would require considerable teacher intervention to be useful for and make sense to any particular group of students. They do, however, present interesting ideas and potentially useful methods for teachers wishing to develop their own drawing programs for their own groups of early adolescent students. It is extremely important, however, for

teachers to recognize not only the developmental emphases of the programs, but also the cultural valuing system and aesthetic ideals embedded within them. When teachers couple such recognition with understanding of their own groups, they can construct contextual drawing programs more closely suited to their own students' developmental strengths and weaknesses as well as their sociocultural environments and cultural heritages.

By selecting judiciously from methods, systems, and aesthetic orientations suggested by published drawing programs, teachers can relate directly to the needs, cultures, and life experiences of their students. While such an eclectic approach to curriculum construction may seem unsystematic, insofar as it is grounded in the students' immediate context, makes sense to them, has the potential for developing pride in their heritage, and offers options for a broader understanding of others, it can be extremely beneficial.

Programs do not teach drawing, teachers do. They are more than instruments of generic curriculum transfer, and drawing program writers should respond by assisting them in contextual curriculum construction. On the other hand, teachers should not rely upon published generic drawing programs' goals or content, but rather be assertive in developing their own in order to more honestly assist their early adolescent students to understand, value, and develop skill in personally meaningful drawing systems.

Guidelines for Contextual Drawing Program Construction

Assessment guidelines for contextual drawing programs constructed by teachers should include a determination as to whether the programs will provide students: (a) opportunities for cognitive, perceptual, and psycho social growth ; (b) explanations of their drawing heritages in terms of graphic systems, symbols, values, and traditions; (c) opportunities for skill development within their own cultures' drawing systems; and (d) expanded frames of reference in terms of other drawing systems' symbols, values, and traditions, especially those of cultures that directly impact or co-exist in time and space with the students' cultures.

Teachers can also use these four guidelines to assess published drawing programs' goals and content for addressing the needs of specific student populations. For instance, a cursory look at the goals for each of the six drawing programs presented in the summary tables shows aesthetic ideals focusing upon mimesis and emotionalism. Anderson (1990) provides useful definitions of the two aesthetic theories . . . "A Greek-derived term related to such English words as 'imitate' and 'mime,' the term mimesis is now used with reference to art that is made with the conscious intention of representing and conveying to the percipient some concrete, specific, extra-artistic subject matter" (p. 220). Brookes subscribes to mimesis by stressing recognizable objects, Edwards, by promoting naturalism, McFee and Degge, as well as Wilson, Hurwitz, and Wilson by accenting accurate observation and natural perspective, and Wilson and Wilson by emphasizing accurate body proportions.

Emotionalism . . . "as a coherent and pervasive theory appeared in the form of the romantic movement which viewed art as an embodiment and expression of emotion . . . . The creative process itself became a major focus of interest . . . . it became popular to speak of artistic 'expression' " (Anderson, 1990, p. 211). Edwards is concerned with emotionalism if she believes that students should learn to render naturalistically so they can express themselves. Lowenfeld and Brittain believe students should learn to have confidence in their own means of graphic expression, while Wilson, Hurwitz, and Wilson want students to expand their creativity, imaginations, and expressivity. Wilson and Wilson wish to help students actualize their spontaneity and creativity. These are all goals that stress emotionalist aesthetic ideals.

Although mimesis and emotionalism are time-honored Western European aesthetic ideals, under the terms of the guidelines for drawing program assessment these aesthetics may be at odds with some students' drawing heritages. They can work against fostering respect and awareness of divergent aesthetic ideals, as well as functioning as limitations and impediments to developmental dimensions. For example, all the drawing programs that focus upon perceptual development subscribe to mimetic ideals insofar as the ability to see and render objects in space from a single viewpoint using "complex perspective systems to illustrate three-dimensional space" (McFee & Degge, p. 374). Edwards explains this aesthetic ideal and developmental endpoint as being the system developed by Renaissance artists and conforming "most closely to the way people in our Western culture perceive objects in space" (p. 117). She adds that other

cultures such as Egyptian or Oriental have developed systems that are different and many times "used by children" (p. 117). Equation of depiction systems with those of children sets up a cultural hierarchy that promotes Eurocentric models as a universal aesthetic ideal and universal developmental endpoint for perceptual and graphic representation. If the only endpoint for a study of perspective within a drawing program is Renaissance perspective, it provides students growth opportunities in perceptual development for visual discrimination from a single fixed viewpoint, but it limits students' growth opportunities for understanding and valuing other cultures. Teachers must realize that such a system of depiction is not aesthetically value-free. Further, given the diversity of subcultures in our classrooms, it may exclude important aspects of students' cultural heritage, disregarding traditional drawing systems, symbols, and aesthetic values.

Hagen (1986), a perceptual psychologist, analyzed similarities and differences in the perceptual and geometrical foundations of several systems of representation. She included those of ancient Egypt, Japan, Northwest Coast Native America, and Europe among others. Basing her ideas on Gibson's (1979) notion of invariant structure, she pointed out that systems of representation in various cultures tend to preserve more or fewer invariants for depiction. She noted that the projective system of depiction used by Renaissance artists is clearly cultural, and of the systems she studied, it is one of the most subjective (along with that of cave art of the Ice Age and the Bushmen art of Southern Africa who used the same depiction system) by retaining the fewest invariant structures. Furthermore, she discovered no

developmental pattern across time or culture for systems of representation. That finding that refutes the notion of a correlation between the development of children and the universal development of human perception and aesthetics. According to Hagen, "Even if we disregard all the criteria but that of improvement, it is probably not the case that the changes that take place in depiction style, in a culture or in an individual, reveal development toward any particular goal" (p. 267). Such information makes the teaching of drawing from only one system of depiction questionable in a classroom of American students from many subcultures and backgrounds.

The drawing experience and art learning of students of African-American descent provide an example of content inappropriate for sociocultural context, as well as aesthetic imperialism when only one drawing system is valued as a developmental and aesthetic endpoint. DePillars (1990) noted the enormous role that curricula play in the identity formation of students and argues that American children of African ancestry have been deprived of an understanding of their cultures' histories and valuing systems. He believes this deprivation has occurred, in part, because of the "dis-Africanization" (p. 121) of Western European art history, allowing children with African backgrounds to grow "into man-and womanhood with the belief that their history represents the ghettos, slums, and cesspools of human-kind on earth" (p.121).

Twiggs (1990) clearly described the feelings of powerlessness and alienation experienced by disadvantaged African-American students as they met curricula and teachers. DePillars (1990) believes these young people should realize evidence supports the notion that their heritage includes

distinctly developed civilizations such as ancient Egypt, a culture comprised of Black Africans and highly respected by many, including the ancient Greeks. From such a position, serious study of the forms, meanings, and values of ancient Egyptian drawing systems could be part of the drawing education for African-American children. In any event, references to ancient Egyptian drawing systems as child-like are damaging and overlook the diversity of perceptual and representational options available to humanity, as well as the psycho social development of students in terms of positive self-image. Thus, drawing programs that seek to develop perception while at the same time privileging Eurocentric depiction systems can work against the psycho social development and self-esteem of African-American students.

This is not to say that teachers should not teach or teach about projective depiction systems. On the contrary, it is a valued aesthetic tradition in our Western society, and as Ogbu (1992) points out, minority ". . . students should recognize and accept the fact that they can participate in two cultural or language frames of reference for different purposes without losing their own cultural and language identity . . . " (p. 12). When teachers do teach about projection depiction systems, however, I believe they should relate it to the students' sociocultural environment and heritage as well as present it in a non-hierarchical manner. After all, three cultures separated in time and space based their art on a projective depiction system, not exclusively that of Renaissance Italy (Hagen,1986), so why not explore the similarities and differences in use and meaning of the system among these cultures?

A look at the programs that focus upon cognitive development provides a second example of the assessment use of the guidelines for deciding published drawing programs' content suitability for specific student populations. They suggested the use of themes. Unfortunately, the example lessons focus upon fine art, thereby excluding many art products, materials, artists, and subject matters that may be relevant to specific culture groups. Nonetheless, I believe the method itself could prove useful, especially if teachers adopt a non-hierarchical approach. For instance, Spruill-Fleming (1990) argued for a content-centered approach to curriculum construction to provide greater cognitive sophistication for students. Her thematic approach seems a reasonable model for contextual drawing program construction because it allows for a focus upon relationships among art cultures rather than a focus upon methods and media within a single depiction system. By using her thematic model, art teachers can develop drawing programs that stress relevant meanings for their culturally diverse students while providing "transnational linkages" (Spruill-Fleming, 1990, p.139) between art students and their ethnic and cultural global antecedents.

Spruill-Fleming suggests a unit focusing upon the influence of African sculpture on the development of the modern Western European art concept of "simultaneity." Such a unit would not only link African-American art students with their heritage in a positive manner, but also introduce another system of graphic depiction, thereby underscoring the notion of a multiplicity of representation systems. Spruill-Fleming's suggestions correlate with the drawing programs that take a primarily cognitive approach. They advocate drawing development through reflection upon

personal and cultural symbols, themes, and subject matter, and suggest both popular and fine art as graphic models.

When adopting the thematic approach, however, it is important to make a distinction between themes of "transnational linkage" and themes that promote a hierarchy of aesthetic values that can result in aesthetic imperialism. More specifically, while the published drawing programs that focus upon cognitive development advocate geographical, racial, and ethnic cross-cultural awareness, their authors nonetheless maintain that the aesthetic ideals for drawing development rest in the fine art museums of the Western world. They suggest the use of popular, ethnic, or subcultural imagery as stepping stones to the art museum door. When teachers use the idea of themes in this hierarchical fashion, they use them to bolster a ranking system for art forms.

If the "simultaneity" theme suggested by Spruill-Fleming is used to link African-American early adolescent to their heritage while at the same time adopting the Western European hierarchy of fine over other forms of art, what will these children to learn about their ancestry? Will they learn how sophisticated African art forms with distinctive, spiritual meanings, and related to one specific African culture group (Chandra, 1992), were appropriated by Western artists for their expressive formal qualities, with little concern for their original contextual significance, and used as part of the foundation for the Western concept of modern fine art? Or will they learn that that expressive art forms developed by native, "primitive" peoples were appropriated into a complex, more valuable, art form and aesthetic system? I hope it will be the former, but unless teachers take charge of

their own drawing program construction in a contextually thoughtful, informed, and reflective manner, I expect it will be the latter.

Summary

Meaningful drawing curriculum construction is an especially difficult challenge for teachers of early adolescent students given their "crisis of confidence" with art skills and self-expression (Chapman, 1978; Feldman, 1970; Gardner, 1982). Critical examination of published drawing programs is crucial for meeting the developmental as well as the cultural needs of our increasingly divergent student populations. When developmental and cultural diversity is considered, the notion of a drawing program appropriate for universal use becomes questionable. Teachers need ways to evaluate drawing programs and to construct contextually sensitive curricula. In this paper I outlined the philosophies, goals, methods, and developmental emphases of six drawing programs that can be helpful for teachers of early adolescent students. Additionally, I presented guidelines for constructing balanced and culturally relevant drawing programs. I pointed out ways that aesthetic ideals, goals, and contents of published drawing programs may reduce the educational potential for students while being at odds with developmental dimensions. Since contextually constructed curricula are so important for sensitive and meaningful teaching, more needs to be done to assist classroom art teachers in the assessment of drawing programs' contents and worth for their own art classrooms.

References

Anderson, R. L. (1990). Calliope's sisters: A comparative study of philosophies of art. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Brookes, M. (1986). Drawing with children. New York: J. P. Tarcher.

Caine, R. N., & Caine, G. (1991). Making connections: Teaching and the human brain. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Chandra, J. (1992). The aesthetics of African art. Journal of Multicultural and Cross-cultural Research in Art Education, 9, 51-56.

Chapman, L. (1978). Approaches to art in education. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Depillars, M. N. (1990). Multiculturalism in visual arts education: Are America's educational institutions ready for multiculturalism? In B. Young (Ed.), Art, culture, and ethnicity (pp. 115-133). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Edwards, B. (1979). Drawing on the right side of the brain. Los Angeles: J. P. Tarcher.

Feldman, E. B. (1970). Becoming human through art: Aesthetic experience in the school. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Gardner, H. (1982). Art, mind and brain: A cognitive approach to creativity. New York: Basic Books.

Gibson, E. J., & Spelke, E. S. (1983). The development of perception. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), Handbook of child psychology (pp. 1-76). New York: Wiley.

Gibson, J. J. (1979). The ecological approach to visual perception. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, L. L. (1967). The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research. Chicago: Aldine.

Hagen, M. A. (1986). Varieties of realism: Geometries of representational art. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Lowenfeld, V., & Brittain, W. L. (1982). Creative and mental growth (6th ed.). New York: Macmillan.

McFee, J. K., & Degge, R. M. (1977). Art, culture and environment. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Moody, L. J. (1992). An analysis of drawing programs for early adolescents. Studies in Art Education, 34(1), 39-47.

Ogbu, J. U. (1992). Understanding cultural diversity and learning. Educational Researcher, 21(8), 5-14, 24.

Parker, R. & Pollock, G. (1981). Old mistresses: Women, art, and ideology. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Snow, R. E., & Yalow, E. (1982). Education and intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), Handbook of human intelligence (pp. 493-585). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Spruill-Fleming, P. (1990). Linking the legacy: Approaches to the teaching of African and American art. In B. Young (Ed.), Art, culture, and ethnicity (pp. 135-153). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Sternberg, R., & Salter, W. (1982). Conceptions of intelligence. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), Handbook of human intelligence (pp. 3-28). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Twiggs, L. F. (1990). Teaching art to disadvantaged black students: Strategies for a learning style. In B. Young (Ed.), Art, culture, and ethnicity (pp. 1-13). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Wilson, B., Hurwitz, A., & Wilson, M. (1987). Teaching drawing from art. Worcester, MA: Davis.

Wilson, M., & Wilson, B. (1982). Teaching children to draw. Englewood Cliff, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Table 1
Brookes Program

Format Section	Summary of Data
Hypotheses	1. Because drawing is not a function of talent, a "way of seeing" will help everyone learn to draw, alleviating drawing problems and freeing intuitive thinking and creativity. 2. Instruction is most successful when a simple-to-complex, step-by-step method is used. 3. This program aids other aspects of education.
Definition	Good drawing is the integration of observation and imagination which shows the artist's own style and composition. Drawing skill depends upon an ability to copy, but spirit, essence, and meaning are more important than correctness.
Rationale	Drawing increases perceptual abilities, perseverance, and artistic confidence.
Goal	Overcome crisis of confidence by knowing ways of drawing recognizable objects. Expand perceptual awareness toward visual differentiation and appreciation of differing styles.

Methods	At lower levels copy or trace two-dimensional models using only line; at higher levels draw from three dimensional objects using line and value. Sample lessons are very detailed and include warm-up techniques, games, and technical information. The suggested lesson sequence is: (a) warm up, (b) plan, (c) begin, (d) add finishing touches, and (e) add color and embellish.
Levels	Three readiness levels are presented which are determined by the complexity of visual patterns learners are able to perceive and duplicate. Attention span and motor coordination rather than age are said to determine learner level.

Table 2
Edwards Program

Summary of Data	
Format Section	
Hypotheses	1. Drawing is a skill which can be learned by average people with normal coordination and eyesight. 2. A new way of seeing could be developed by tapping into the right hemisphere of the brain; this new seeing will enable drawing.
Definition	Manual dexterity is not a primary factor in drawing skill, but learning to see in an extraordinary manner is.
Rationale	Drawing sharpens visual senses and should be taught to release creative and problem-solving potential and to bring to conscious level intuitive, imaginative powers.
Goal	Expand perceptual powers and sharpen visual senses to extend expressiveness. Facilitate a mental shift to another mode of observation and thought, allowing students to learn to see and thus to draw naturalistically as a way of increasing their expressive ability.
Methods	Time-honored exercises used by previous art educators are used to facilitate a cognitive shift.
Levels	No levels presented. "Realistic" stage discussed. Exercises suitable for students as young as ten years.

Table 3

McFee and Degge Program

Format Section	Summary of Data
Hypotheses	1. Drawing achievement is a matter of learning to observe. 2. Levels of drawing achievement determined by Perception-Delineation Theory factors: (a) readiness (potential, opportunity, motivation); (b) psychocultural classroom environment; (c) visual-physical environment; (d) process of information handling; (e) delineating and responding to art; and (f) feedback and evaluation.
Definition	Highly developed drawings record, analyze, or express feelings and/or values, creating new ideas, relationships, or structures.
Rationale	Drawing is a tool for learning, providing a basis for language formation and visual sensitivity toward environmental responsibility; balances tendency for generalization by promoting visual specifics leading toward richer mental images.
Goals	Help students learn to see and thus draw with more authority; help students learn to draw and thereby see in greater detail. Assist students to use drawing for creating art, learning, and analyzing; expand potential for experience.

Methods	Activities and performance objectives in each of the four levels provided for seven basic areas of observation: (a) details and spatial relationships; (b) sizes of shapes in space; (c) shapes changed by viewpoint; (d) structures of things; (e) different lights; (f) perspective systems; and (g) emotional qualities.
Levels	Four levels of complexity are based upon perceptual, intellectual, and psychomotor understanding which for the most part were not age based. Early adolescents may be found at any level.

Table 4

Lowenfeld and Brittain Program

Summary of Data	
Format Section	
Hypothesis:	There are two types of students: (a)"visuals" described as stimulated mainly by optical sense, and (b)"haptics" described as more in tune with body sensations and subjective experiences.
Rationale	Creativity, self-concept, and mental health are reasons for teaching drawing; promotes individuality and is therapeutic for emotional release.
Definition	Creativity is the foundation of drawing skills and is indexed by freedom of expression, flexible use of materials, number of works produced, drawing approach, and number of unique solutions.
Goal	Develop greater confidence in own means of expression through ability to think creatively and for oneself. Cooperate with others to achieve goals.
Methods	Topics for motivations are provided. Few specific activities.
Levels	Definite age-related drawing developmental stages with endpoint of naturalism proposed. Early adolescents may be found in either of two described stages with intellectual development usually more advanced than emotional.

Table 5

Wilson, Hurwitz, and Wilson Program

	Summary of Data
Format Section	
Hypotheses	1. Drawing is a unique symbol system which expands knowledge in a different way from other systems. 2. Individuals construct drawing symbols from direct experience and knowledge of others' symbols.
Definition	Drawing depends upon the ability to represent visual qualities and memory. Naturalistic drawing requires both graphic symbols and working from nature. Creative drawing depends upon observation and invention. High quality drawings: (a) have a developed style, (b) go beyond accurate rendering, and (c) have compositions that convey meaning.
Rationale	Drawing aids cognition and abilities to symbolize, as well as aids understanding meanings of artworks.
Goals	Expand world knowledge as well as accurate observation, creativity, imagination, and expressivity. Experience affective and aesthetic visual learning while moving beyond universal, biologically inherited drawing tendencies referred to as "graphic biases" (p. 25). Know ways to produce personal stylistic and expressive qualities in memory, perspective, action, figure, and environmental drawings. Be able to talk and write about drawings' symbols, themes,and subjects, realizing the historical contexts of exemplar drawings.

Methods — Ways of helping students extend beyond observational drawing are outlined. Memory drawing is stressed, and ways of teaching are given. Example lessons are presented which relate to specific themes, ways to teach imagination, perspective, and creating from verbal stimuli. There is considerable procedural information for teachers.

Levels — No stages are presented. Drawings change as a result of: (a) intrinsic graphic biases, (b) organic growth, (c) individual abilities and traits, (d) cultural symbols, and (e) learning opportunities. Naturalism need not be only endpoint. Drive toward cultural style curtails graphic tendencies, although teaching is required to extend and preserve selected tendencies.

Table 6

Wilson and Wilson Program

Summary of Data	
Format Section	
Hypotheses	1. School drawing and spontaneous drawing have different goals, content, and outcomes. 2. Learning to speak and learning to draw have similar foundations.
Definition	Spontaneous drawing provides a source of aesthetic and kinesthetic pleasure, relief from boredom, stimulation, self-satisfaction, and symbolic possession of objects. Four kinds of spontaneous drawing realities engaged in by students are discussed: (a) common reality, (b) archaeological reality, (c) normative reality, (d) prophetic reality. School drawing provides teacher structured "creative" experiences.
Rationale	Provides format for creative cultural interpretation; aids spontaneity and imagination, especially with adult guidance and screening of models.
Goals	Actualize the child's spontaneity and creativity as well as elevate spontaneous art to its important position in the the development of children. Bring school art closer to spontaneous art by exposing and allowing students to copy good models, interacting with students as they draw, showing them a slightly higher level than their own.

Methods — Exercises to expand graphic vocabularies and increase imaginative skills are included. A portfolio of graphic sources is suggested for students.

Levels: — Natural unfolding drawing stages are not aged based. No universal development of graphic symbols, but presence of innate preference for certain types of visual order suggested. Early adolescents could be in the last unfolding stage described.